CANUCK LAW

Reporting That You're Not Getting Elsewhere (Do Your Own Research To Verify)

FEBRUARY 24, 2026 BY RONNIE

Residents In Edgewood Sue CFIA Over Property Seizure, 3rd Party Claim Likely

SUPREME COURT
OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
10
FEB 24 2026
VERNON
REGISTRY

NO. 59306
VERNON REGISTRY

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

**ALYSON TURNBULL, TREVOR KLUG,
and MARGARET GREBA**

PLAINTIFFS

AND:

**CANADIAN FOOD INSPECTION AGENCY,
HIS MAJESTY THE KING IN RIGHT OF CANADA AS REPRESENTED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA
and ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE,
AS REPRESENTED BY THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE FOR THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**

Over the previous year, Universal Ostrich Farms in Edgewood, B.C., had consistently been mentioned across social media. The primary issues were the hundreds of birds the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) wanted to cull, and the ongoing Court proceedings over it.

See Parts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 in the series for more information.

Now the CFIA is heading back to Court, but it's to answer for their actions last Autumn. The owners of an ***adjacent*** property are suing for damages caused by them and the RCMP. The Notice of Civil Claim (NOCC) names the Attorney General of Canada as the representative for the CFIA. The Justice Minister of B.C. is named as the representative for the RCMP.

Lawsuit Against Government, CFIA, RCMP

As reported by Dacey Media, neighbours of Universal Ostrich Farms filed a lawsuit against the Federal and B.C. Governments in Vernon. The Plaintiffs: (a) Alyson Turnbull; (b) Trevor Klug; and (c) Margaret Greba claim the RCMP illegally seized to their property last Fall. The land is next to, but ***not part of***, UOF.

In late September, 2025 the Federal Court of Appeal upheld the "reasonableness" of the cull order, and a further stay was refused. The CFIA obtained a a warrant to seize UOF, and brought the RCMP as enforcement. The problem arises that they may have taken ***someone else's*** land as well in the process. The NOCC alleges the authorities:

- Disabled surveillance systems
- Restricted owners' right to enter and monitor their own land
- Caused extensive property damage
- Harassed the owners
- Refused to allow owners to bring their pets onto the land
- Refused to allow harvest of garlic and apples
- Refused to allow owners to bring friends and family over
- Blocked access to the property
- Built walls with hay bales and fencing
- Imposed and illegal airspace restriction
- Maintained 24 hour police presence on the property
- Transported bales of hay across the property for the "kill pen"

For approximately 6 weeks, the CFIA and RCMP took over the area, and not just UOF. They also left quite the mess behind when they finally departed. This includes bails of hay

from the “kill pen”.

Most of this were documented by video, so an outright denial will be hard to make. However, there is another way this can play out.

******Note: Even though the Federal Court of Appeal refused a further stay, the Supreme Court issued one pending the decision on whether or not the hear a final challenge. They declined to. But it did keep the birds alive until November.***

Third Party Claim Most Likely Response From Ottawa

Readers will not want to hear this, but this is the probable response that will unfold. The Defendants have an option available that will “shift” the blame onto the owners of UOF. How? Lawyers are sure to argue that there would be no damages, if not for the actions of UOF itself.

In their filings last year, the CFIA went on about how protesters and threats to staff made subsequent visits unsafe without police protection. Expect that narrative to be repeated. They will state it was “unfortunate, but necessary”.

This isn’t to say that the existing suit is doomed to fail. Far from it. But it significantly complicates the matter when Defendants can point to someone else as the main cause of damages.

Should events unfold this way, it’s unclear who would even represent UOF. It’s not like too many lawyers would want to take on the headache, or the risk of not being paid. We will have to see.

TURNBULL ACTION
(1) Turnbull Notice Of Civil Claim
(A) https://x.com/chrisdacey/status/2023869335929061701

B.C. SECURITIES COMMISSION
(A) https://www.bcsc.bc.ca/-/media/PWS/Resources/Enforcement/Decisions/2002/2002-BCSECCOM-102.pdf

SUPREME COURT OF CANADA DOCUMENTS (LEAVE TO APPEAL APPLICATION)

(1) UOF SCC Decisions Of FC And FCA

(2) UOF SCC Notice Of Application For Leave To Appeal

(3) UOF SCC Notice Of Name

(4) UOF SCC Application No Prohibition On Publication

(5) UOF SCC Application For Leave To Appeal

(6) UOF SCC Memorandum Arguments For Leave To Appeal

(7) UOF SCC Notification Opposing Leave

(8) UOF SCC Response To Application For Leave

(9) UOF SCC Applicants Reply Memorandum

(10) UOF SCC Applicants Reply

COURT OF APPEAL (CHALLENGING JUSTICE ZINN'S ORDER)

(1) Ostrich APPEAL Notice Of Appeal (May, 2025)

(2) UOF APPEAL Notice Of Appearance (May, 2025)

(3) UOF FCA Appeal Denied (August, 2025)

(4) UOF FCA Motion To Stay Dismissed (September, 2025)

COURT OF APPEAL (MOTION TO STAY CULL ORDER)

(1) UOF APPEAL Motion Record To Stay Culling (June, 2025)

(2) UOF APPEAL Notice Of Motion To Stay Culling (June, 2025)

(3) UOF APPEAL Bilinski Affidavit To Stay Culling (June, 2025)

(4) UOF APPEAL Bilinski Affidavit Exhibit E June, 2025)

(5) UOF APPEAL Espersen Affidavit To Stay Culling (June, 2025)

(6) UOF APPEAL Moving Party Submissions To Stay Culling (June, 2025)

(7) UOF APPEAL Responding Motion Record Volume 1

(8) UOF APPEAL Responding Motion Record Volume 2 (June, 2025)

(9) UOF APPEAL Responding Submissions To Stay Culling (June, 2025)

(10) UOF APPEAL Order Staying Cullings Pending Appeal (June, 2025)

COURT OF APPEAL (JUSTICE BATTISTA STAYING CULL ORDER):

(1) UOF Order To Stay Culling (January, 2025)

(2) UOF Notice Of Appeal (February, 2025)

(3) UOF Notice Of Appearance (February, 2025)

(4) UOF Agreement Appeal Book Contents (March, 2025)

(5) UOF Joint Appeal Book (April, 2025)

(6) UOF Consent To Extend Time (May, 2025)
(7) UOF Notice Of Discontinuance (May, 2025)

FEDERAL COURT DOCUMENTS (CFIA):
(1) Ostrich Notice Of Application Certified (January, 2025)
(2) Ostrich Notice Of Application (January, 2025)
(3) Ostrich Notice Of Motion (January, 2025)
(4) Ostrich Bilinski Affidavit (January, 2025)
(5) Ostrich Espersen Affidavit (January, 2025)
(6) Ostrich Pelech Affidavit (January, 2025)
(7) Ostrich Jones Affidavit (January, 2025)
(8) Ostrich Responding Motion Record (January, 2025)
(9) Ostrich Responding Motion Record Expedited (February, 2025)
(10) Ostrich Motion Record Ex-Parte (February, 2025)
(11) Ostrich Exemption Notice Of Application (February, 2025)
(12) Ostrich Exemption Motion Record (February, 2025)
(13) Ostrich Ruling Of Justice Zinn (May, 2025)

MONEY:
(1) https://bcrising.ca/save-our-ostriches/
(2) https://www.gofundme.com/f/help-ostrich-farmers-fight-to-save-herd-from-avian-flu?attribution_id=sl%3A80e09934-7413-429b-acfb-2f7015cc19d3&lang=en_CA
(3) https://www.givesendgo.com/save-our-ostriches
(4) https://www.kinexus.ca/

CANADA, OSTRICHES, PROCEDURAL